

REMARKS

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,096,257 to Trisno et al. ("Trisno"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,832,321 to Barrett ("Barrett"), in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0007411 to Shaked et al. ("Shaked"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0169937 to Kagawa ("Kagawa"); rejected claims 2 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Trisno, Barrett, Shaked, Kagawa*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,127,524 to Renda et al. ("Renda"); and rejected claims 3 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Trisno, Barrett, Shaked, Kagawa, Renda*, and further in view of "Hypertext Transfer Protocol - HTTP/1.1" to Fielding et al. ("Fielding").

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 4-6, and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 1 recites an apparatus comprising, for example:

a memory section for storing a MAC address table in which one or more manually registered client MAC addresses and one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses are registered in forms to distinguish each other;

... a registration processing section for executing a setting change process for changing an entry of the one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses to an entry of the one or more manually registered client MAC addresses in the MAC address table,

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

(emphasis added). *Trisno* does not teach or suggest at least the claimed “memory section,” and “registration processing section.”

Trisno discloses “assigning a different network address to each node in a network” (col. 2, lines 47-48). Each node in a network “broadcasts a unique identifier for the node to other nodes and receives the unique identifiers for the other nodes. . . . Each node assigns a different network address to each of the nodes based on the unique identifier received from the node” (col. 2, lines 49-53). *Trisno* also discloses network addresses for one or more nodes may be “manually configured by a network administrator or other user” (col. 7, lines 33-34). These nodes may recognize “network addresses that have been manually configured and does not change the network addresses” (col. 7, lines 42-44).

According to *Trisno*, network addresses of nodes may be automatically or manually assigned. However, *Trisno* does not manually and automatically register “client MAC addresses” for access control. There is no teaching or suggestion in *Trisno* of registering “one or more manually registered client MAC addresses and one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses” in “forms to distinguish each other,” as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner correctly states that *Trisno* does not teach or suggest a “registration processing section” (Office Action at page 6). Therefore, *Trisno* does not teach or suggest “a registration processing section for executing a setting change process for changing an entry of the one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses to an entry of the one or more manually registered client MAC addresses in the MAC address table,” as further recited in claim 1.

Barrett does not cure the deficiencies of *Trisno*. *Barrett* discloses “a method of controlling access to a client computer connected to a network” (col. 3, lines 41-42). However, *Barrett* does not teach or suggest “a memory section for storing a MAC address table in which one or more manually registered client MAC addresses and one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses are registered in forms to distinguish each other,” and “a registration processing section for executing a setting change process for changing an entry of the one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses to an entry of the one or more manually registered client MAC addresses in the MAC address table,” as recited in claim 1.

Kagawa does not cure the deficiencies of *Trisno* and *Barrett*. *Kagawa* discloses providing “a table management method and device allowing efficient hash search with suppressing the possibility of occurrence of rehashing” (paragraph 0010). *Kagawa* does not teach or suggest “a memory section for storing a MAC address table in which one or more manually registered client MAC addresses and one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses are registered in forms to distinguish each other,” and “a registration processing section for executing a setting change process for changing an entry of the one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses to an entry of the one or more manually registered client MAC addresses in the MAC address table,” as recited in claim 1.

Shaked does not cure the deficiencies of *Trisno*, *Barrett*, and *Kagawa*. *Shaked* discloses “acquiring the identity of a user requesting service from a service provider” (paragraph 0010). In *Shaked*, a “look-up table is updated manually whenever network address assignments change . . . [or] is updated automatically from the NAP

identification module based on information reported from the access system”
(paragraph 0034).

Shaked updates a look-up table. However, manually or automatically updating a look-up table does not teach or suggest “executing a setting change process for changing an entry of the one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses to an entry of the one or more manually registered client MAC addresses in the MAC address table.” Any address information that may exist in the look-up table of *Shaked* is not changed from one entry to another entry. Therefore, *Shaked* does not teach or suggest “a registration processing section for executing a setting change process for changing an entry of the one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses to an entry of the one or more manually registered client MAC addresses in the MAC address table,” as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, *Trisno*, *Barrett*, *Shaked*, and *Kagawa* fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. Claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and are thus also allowable over *Trisno*, *Barrett*, *Shaked*, and *Kagawa*, for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Independent claims 6 and 11 and dependent claims 9 and 10, while of different scope than claim 1, are allowable over *Trisno*, *Barrett*, *Shaked*, and *Kagawa* for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 2 and 7, dependent from claims 1 and 6. *Renda* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Trisno*, *Barrett*, *Shaked*, and *Kagawa* discussed above. *Renda* does not teach or suggest “a memory section for storing a MAC address table in which one or more manually registered client MAC

addresses and one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses are registered in forms to distinguish each other," and "a registration processing section for executing a setting change process for changing an entry of the one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses to an entry of the one or more manually registered client MAC addresses in the MAC address table," as recited in independent claim 1, similarly recited in independent claim 6, and required by dependent claims 2 and 7. Therefore, claims 2 and 7 are also allowable over *Trisno, Barrett, Shaked, Kagawa, and Renda*.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 3 and 8, dependent from claims 1 and 6. *Fielding* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Trisno, Barrett, Shaked, Kagawa, and Renda* discussed above. *Fielding* does not teach or suggest "a memory section for storing a MAC address table in which one or more manually registered client MAC addresses and one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses are registered in forms to distinguish each other," and "a registration processing section for executing a setting change process for changing an entry of the one or more automatically registered client MAC addresses to an entry of the one or more manually registered client MAC addresses in the MAC address table," as recited in independent claim 1, similarly recited in independent claim 6, and required by dependent claims 3 and 8. Therefore, claims 3 and 8 are also allowable over *Trisno, Barrett, Shaked, Kagawa, Renda, and Fielding*.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 09812.0213-00
Application No. 10/521,624

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge
any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 5, 2008

By: 

Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921